

what could be more proper than that, instead of all this smokescreen and nonsense that has been raised today?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure how relevant it is, but could the minister say whether the reference to the Newfoundland additional grants act is a reference to an act which has been passed or which is proposed to be passed?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, Mr. Speaker. In the table, as you will notice, the first line refers to payments under the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act, as amended. Then it goes on to deal with the statutory subsidies, then the transitional grants to Newfoundland, and then the additional grants to Newfoundland. There is as yet no statutory authority for the payment of the additional grants to Newfoundland, and that will be the purpose of legislation to be introduced.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the point of privilege which the Leader of the Opposition raises is that by referring to an act in the white paper as though it had been passed the minister is, in effect, offering an affront to parliament, which has not yet passed the act. If the act has not yet been passed but is only contemplated or in the bill stage, perhaps the minister would agree to the insertion of the word "proposed" before "Newfoundland additional grants act"?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I would be more than happy and ready to agree to that if it would make my hon. friends happy. Certainly it has no legislative effect, and if my hon. friends opposite object to the proposed legislation, perhaps it cannot be passed.

Mr. Pearson: The minister has made some statements that would call for some words from me. In the first place he said if we object to the passing of this legislation, why do we not say so? At the beginning of my remarks I said that the questions of the extent and nature of the government's obligations under the terms of union were not at issue. We have made our position clear on that.

Then the minister, who was in the past always so sensitive, even so spectacular about his devotion to the rights of parliament, said that this particular addition to *Hansard* really did not have any validity because it was something that had been introduced into the record before the budget speech and did not require the permission of the house that evening for such introduction. If the minister will look at page 2410 of *Hansard* for April 9, 1959, he will see that he asked permission of the house to introduce these budget statements as part of the records of the house.

Reference to Statement in Budget Papers

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, no.

Mr. Pearson: Now, just a minute.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The Leader of the Opposition is quite wrong.

Mr. Pearson: I shall read from *Hansard*, page 2410:

There will be a number of tables that by leave of the house I will propose to place on the record of *Hansard* tonight, if the house were prepared to give its consent to that now I might save interrupting later.

So, Mr. Speaker, on page 55 of the budget papers we have one such table.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, no.

Mr. Pearson: The explanation of that table reads, "Under the Newfoundland additional grants act", not an act which is the proposed and which if the house passes it will be the basis for these additional grants, but under an act which assumes that parliament has already taken action. In support of that interpretation, Mr. Speaker, I cite the last sentence of this paragraph, which reads:

The additional grants for the first two fiscal years, which are payable in 1958-59—

Not, "would amount" to \$13.5 million, but the words used are "amounted to \$13.5 million", as if they had already been covered by an act which has not even been introduced in this house in the resolution stage.

This is the point of privilege. If the minister will admit that he is wrong, and if this correction is made and it is admitted that it is a mistake his department made, perhaps on the assumption that the Prime Minister said he would introduce a bill and have it passed; if he will get up and admit that they made this mistake and if he will make the necessary corrections, we need not proceed with this motion.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): There is one correction that needs to be made at once in the hon. gentleman's understanding of the situation concerning these tables. The white paper is not one of the tables for which permission to incorporate in *Hansard* was sought and obtained during the course of the budget speech on Thursday night. The white paper appears in the records of the house by reason of a motion passed on Wednesday, April 8, at page 2343 of *Hansard*, and which reads as follows:

That the budget papers be published as an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings* and also as an appendix to tomorrow's *Hansard*.

That was the authority given by the house for inscribing the white paper in the records of the house. When at page 2410 of *Hansard*, in the course of the budget speech of Thursday evening, April 9, I asked for leave